

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ASUS COMPUTER INTERNATIONAL,
Plaintiff,
v.
ROUND ROCK RESEARCH, LLC,
Defendant.

Case No. 12-cv-02099-JST

**ORDER RE: BRIEF ADDRESSING
MAGISTRATE JUDGE COUSINS'
ORDER ON MOTIONS TO STRIKE**

Re: ECF No. 374

On April 11, 2014, Judge Cousins issued an Order granting in part and denying in part the parties' motions to strike. ECF No. 374. If the parties have any disagreement over which portions of the record are now stricken, Judge Cousins has ordered the parties to submit a letter brief by April 18, 2014, explaining their disagreement, organized by the arguments addressed by Judge Cousins' Order.

As contemplated at the first summary judgment hearing held April 10, 2014, the parties are now ORDERED also to file a joint letter brief by April 25, 2014, matching each subsection of Judge Cousins' Order (e.g., Part A.i.: Doctrine of Equivalents) to the portions of the record now stricken (with citations to docket number) and the products or theories affected by the striking of that portion of the record. The Parties shall either (1) indicate their agreement over whether a particular product or theory is still in the case, or (2) explain their disagreement over whether or to what extent a particular product or theory is still in the case.

In addition, attached to the letter brief, the parties shall provide, for each patent-in-suit, a comprehensive list of the accused products remaining in the case, with notations for those subject to dispute, as discussed above.

The Court intentionally has not indicated a page limit for the letter brief or its attachments.

1 The Court expects the parties to use their good judgment in succinctly summarizing their
2 arguments, and in crafting a document that best conveys to the Court, in format and content, how
3 the scope of the case and the pending motions for summary judgment have changed as a
4 consequence of Judge Cousins' Order. This letter brief is not an opportunity to make further
5 summary judgment argument to the Court; it is, instead, intended to summarize for the Court
6 which summary judgment arguments are still applicable, and which are now conceded.

7 The parties are encouraged to contact the Courtroom Deputy should they have any
8 questions or seek further guidance.

9 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

10 Dated: April 14, 2014

11 
12 JON S. TIGAR
13 United States District Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28